

## REMARKS

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 32, 40, 49 and 59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. Claims 32, 40, 49 and 59 have been amended to delete the limitation “during the session.” Therefore, the rejection of these claims is moot.

### REJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

#### Claims 32-33, 40-41, 43, and 49-50

Claims 32-33, 40, 43, and 49-50 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,522,880 issued to Verma et al. (*Verma*) in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0174194 attributed to Mooney et al. (*Mooney*).

One problem with conventional techniques for interfacing wireless communication devices with a global data network (e.g., the Internet) is that conventional techniques do not anticipate the need for wireless handovers, wherein an Internet communication session moves from one network end-point (e.g., basestation) to another. See Applicant’s Specification, paragraph [0007]. These conventional techniques cause the creation of obsolete communication sessions between a basestation (that is no longer servicing a particular computing client) and the network access server. See Specification, paragraph [0007]. Neither *Verma* nor *Mooney* contemplates or addresses the problems created by applying conventional techniques for interfacing wireless communication devices with a global data network to mobile computing environments. In contrast, the claims of the present invention are directed toward embodiments

aimed at overcoming the limitations of the prior art with respect to interfacing wireless communication devices with a global data network. See Specification, paragraph [0008].

Claim 32 recites, in part, the following:

a communication session identifier that follows the session and the subscriber unit as the subscriber unit moves from one basestation coverage area to another basestation coverage area.

Independent claims 40, 49 and 59 recite similar limitations. These limitations are supported by the Specification (e.g., at paragraphs [0048] and [0056]).

The Office action states that *Verma* fails to teach or disclose a session identifier that accompanies the subscriber unit's access through any of a plurality of basestations. Applicant agrees that *Verma* is deficient in this regard. With respect to the limitations specifically recited in claim 32, as amended, Applicant further submits that *Verma* fails to teach or disclose **a communication session identifier that follows the session and the subscriber unit as the subscriber unit moves from one basestation coverage area to another basestation coverage area.**

*Mooney* discusses providing access to message accounts from a single web-based interface (see Abstract) and does not relate to wireless communication environments. More particularly, *Mooney* does not contemplate mobility of communication sessions in the context of wireless handovers. With respect Applicant's claim 32, *Mooney* does not teach or disclose **a communication session identifier that follows the session and the subscriber unit as the subscriber unit moves from one basestation coverage area to another basestation coverage area.** Thus, *Mooney* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Verma*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully submits claims 32, 40, 49 and 59 are not obvious in view of *Verma* and *Mooney*.

Claim 33 depends from claim 32. Claim 43 depends from claim 40. Claim 50 depends from claim 49. Given that dependent claims necessarily include the limitation of the claims from which they depend, Applicant submits claims 33, 43 and 50 are not obvious in view of *Verma* and *Mooney* for at least the reasons described above.

*Dependent Claims 34-39, 42, 44-47, 51 and 60-63*

Claims 34-39, 42, 45-47, 51 and 60-63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Verma* and *Mooney*, and further in view of various other cited references: specifically, claims 34, 44 and 60 in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2001/0053694 attributed to Igarashi (*Igarashi*); claims 35-39 and 61-63 in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0012149 attributed to Maggenti et al. (*Maggenti*) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,006,266 issued to Murphy, Jr. et al. (*Murphy*); claims 42, 45-47 and 51 in view of *Maggenti*. Applicant notes that the examination of the claimed invention and the application of these numerous references is a significant task; Applicant thanks the Examiner for the thorough examination and the thorough analysis of the references.

Applicant respectfully submits that these claims are not rendered obvious by the cited references for at least the following reasons. Claim 44 has been cancelled without prejudice. Therefore, the rejection of this claim is moot. As to the remaining claims, each of the rejections made above is based on the application of *Verma* and *Mooney*, shown above to be defective with respect to the independent claims 32, 40, 49 and 59 from which each of the above-listed dependent claims depends. The cited references do not cure the deficiencies of *Verma* and *Mooney* noted above with respect to the independent claims. Applicants respectfully submit that a *prima facie* case of obviousness under MPEP § 2143 has not been established with respect to independent claims 32, 40, 49 and 59 at least for failing to establish that the cited references

disclose every element of the claimed invention. Because the independent claims are nonobvious, the dependent claims are also nonobvious. See MPEP § 2143.03.

CONCLUSION

For at least the foregoing reasons, Applicant submits that claims 32-40, 42, 43, 45-47, 49-51 and 59-63 contain allowable subject matter and are in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone if such contact would further the examination of the present application.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overcharges to our Deposit Account number 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,  
**BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN, LLP**



Jared S. Engstrom  
Reg. No. 58,330

12400 Wilshire Boulevard  
Seventh Floor  
Los Angeles, CA 90025-1026  
(503) 439-8778

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail in an envelope addressed to:  
**Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, VA 22313-1450**

On: April 16, 2007

Signature:



Katherine Jennings